

### REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in view of the present amendments and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 19-36 are pending. Claims 19, 21, 23, 25-27, 30 and 33 are amended. No new matter is introduced.<sup>1</sup>

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 19-36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph; and Claims 19-36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

In reply to the rejection of Claims 19-36 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, the specification is amended hereby at pages 2 and 12 to address the issues identified in the outstanding Office Action.

Further, the outstanding Office Action asserts that Claims 19-36 fail to comply with the enablement requirement insofar as the “matching characteristic” is not clearly explained in the specification.<sup>2</sup> Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, as non-limiting support for Claims 19-36 may be found at least at page 17, lines 20-39 of the specification. For example, a relationship among the ohmic resistances of the functional layer, coating and surface electrode is described therein. One of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that surface electrodes matched relative to other surface electrodes are embraced at least by this portion of the description. Further, one of skill in the art would also realize that the scrolling effect is described at least at page 17, line 33 - page 18, line 30 of the specification.

MPEP § 2163.04 states that the written description requirement of 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, is met, unless one of ordinary skill in the art would not recognize in an applicant’s disclosure a description of the invention defined by the claims. It is therefore submitted that Claims 19-36 conform to the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

---

<sup>1</sup> Non-limiting support for the amended claims can be found at least in Figures 1 and 2 and the associated discussion on pages 8-10 and 16-19 of the specification.

<sup>2</sup> See the outstanding Office Action at page 2.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of Claims 19-36 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, be withdrawn.

If, however, the Examiner continues to disagree that Claims 19-36 conform to the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner provide a showing of substantial evidence, why a person skilled in the art would not recognize, in the present disclosure, a description of the features defined by the claims.<sup>3</sup>

With regard to the rejection of Claims 19-36 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, Claims 19, 21, 23, 25-27, 29-30 and 33 are amended to clarify the features contained therein, and to address the issues identified in the outstanding Office Action. As such, it is believed that these claims, as amended, conform to the requirements under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, together with any claim depending therefrom. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of Claims 19-36 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, be withdrawn.

For the reasons discussed above, no further issues are believed to be outstanding in the present application, and the present application is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. Therefore, a Notice of Allowance for Claims 19-36 is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Gregory J. Maier  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 25,599

Aldo Martinez  
Registration No. 61,357

Customer Number  
**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 06/04)

---

<sup>3</sup> MPEP § 2163.04.